

### Remarks

Applicant respectfully requests that this Response After Final Action be admitted under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116.

Applicant submits that this Response presents claims in better form for consideration on appeal. Furthermore, applicant believes that consideration of this Response could lead to favorable action that would remove one or more issues for appeal.

No claims have been amended. No claims have been canceled. Therefore, claims 1-18 are now presented for examination.

Claims 1-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ogaki, U.S. Patent No. 6,771,383 ("Ogaki") in view of Klein, U.S. Publication No. 2005/0060059 ("Klein"). Applicant submits that the present claims are patentable over Ogaki in view of Klein.

Ogaki discloses a mechanism adapted to create multi-page data consisting of image data of a plurality of pages that constitute one document, and to manage the multi-page data in the same stage as single-page data that consists of image data of each page belonging to the document. As a result, an image processing system is realized which can make use of both a single-page file suitable for management or updating of image data performed in units of one page, and a multi-page file suitable for processing of image data performed in units of one document. See Ogaki at Abstract.

Klein discloses discarding a first separator card after a first batch of documents are processed, or reusing the first separator card for a different batch of documents that will be retrieved in the future from the same machine from which the first batch of documents was retrieved. See Klein at paragraph [0313].

Docket No.: 8185P029  
Application No.: 10/782,444

Claim 1 of the present application recites:

A method for processing a separator page used for separating print jobs being output from a printer system, said method comprising:

receiving an input separator page for use in identifying a second print job;

determining if said input separator page contains first print job information indicating use of the input separator page as a first print job page;

obscuring said first print job information if said first print job information is determined to be present on said input separator page; and

printing second print job information on said input separator page thereby providing a second print job separator page.

Applicant submits that neither Ogaki nor Klein discloses or suggests a process of determining if an input separator page contains first print job information indicating use of the input separator page as a first print job page and obscuring the first print job information if the first print job information is determined to be present on said input separator page. The Final Office Action asserts that since Klein discloses reusing a separator card, such steps are implied. See Final Office Action at page 3, lines 5-12.

Applicant respectfully disagree with such an assertion. First, in order to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness:

the Office personnel must articulate the following:

(1) a finding that the prior art included *each element claimed*, although not necessarily in a single prior art reference, with the only difference between the claimed invention and the prior art being the lack of actual combination of the elements in a single prior art reference;

(2) a finding that one of ordinary skill in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods, and that in combination, each element merely performs the same function as it does separately;

(3) a finding that one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable; and

(4) whatever additional findings based on the *Graham* factual inquiries may be necessary, in view of the facts of the case under consideration, to explain a conclusion of obviousness. (emphasis added)

Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP), 8<sup>th</sup> Edition, Revision 6, September 2007, §2143 (A).

Applicant submits that neither of the references cited in the Final Office action disclose or suggest *determining if an input separator page contains first print job information indicating use of the input separator page as a first print job page, or obscuring the first print job information if the first print job information is determined to be present on said input separator page*. Therefore, a *prima facie* case of obviousness since the cited prior does not include *each element claimed*.

Second, applicant submits that the separator card disclosed in Klein is not equivalent to the claimed input separator page. Klein discloses a separator card that includes a conductive material and a rectangular bar. The material is made of an electrically conductive, non-magnetic material, such as aluminum-based polyester film, adhesive-backed copper foil, and conductive ink, has a generally square shape, and it is located in a central location. In some embodiments, the conductive material is a foil. For example, the foil known by the trade designation KoldFoil Metallic, commercially available from Amagic Holographics, Inc., may be used as the material. In this specific embodiment, the foil has a thickness of approximately 16 microns (0.00063") and can range in area and shape depending on the sensor and user requirements. See Klein at paragraph [00289].

Docket No.: 8185P029  
Application No.: 10/782,444

Applicant submits that it would not be inherent to process such an *aluminum-based polyester film, adhesive-backed copper foil* card by obscuring information from a prior print job. Because both Ogaki and Klein each fail to disclose or suggest a process of determining if an input separator page contains first print job information indicating use of the input separator page as a first print job page and obscuring the first print job information if the first print job information is determined to be present on said input separator page, any combination of Ogaki and Klein would also fail to disclose or suggest such a process. As a result, claim 1 and its dependent claims are patentable over Ogaki in view of Klein.

Independent claims 7 and 13 include limitations similar to those recited in claim 1. Thus, claims 7 and 13, and their respective dependent claims are also patentable over Ogaki in view of Klein for reasons similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 1.


Applicant respectfully submits that the rejections have been overcome, and that the claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, applicant respectfully requests the rejections be withdrawn and the claims be allowed.

The Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at (303) 740-1980 if there remains any issue with allowance of the case.

Please charge any shortage to our Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,  
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: September 18, 2008

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Mark L. Watson  
Reg. No. 46,322

1279 Oakmead Parkway  
Sunnyvale, California 94085-4040  
(303) 740-1980

Docket No.: 8185P029  
Application No.: 10/782,444